

1. The reply filed on Aug 20, 2008 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): The restriction requirement dated May 1, 2008 specified that "The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added" (page 4, paragraph 4). However, the claims specified by applicant in the reply to the restriction requirement do not appear to be the correct set of claims readable on the elected species. For instance, applicants have elected acrylic acid/isobutyl acrylate/isobornyl acrylate as the copolymer, and acrylic acid as the additional monomer as the species and submit that claims 80-95, 97-112, and 114-161 read on the elected species.

2. It is noted that claim 96 has been excluded from this claim set. Since claim 98 depends from claim 96, and claim 98 is stated to read on the elected species, claim 96 also necessarily reads on the elected species. Thus, the claim set upon which examination should properly proceed was unclear. Applicants are required to provide an accurate listing of the claims readable upon the elected species which will be examined further on the merits of the claims. Such clarification will facilitate future examination by ensuring that examination commences on the proper claim set.

3. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

KSO

/Sharmila Gollamudi Landau/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1611